

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-17 and 19-25 are pending in this application. For purposes of expedition, base claim 1 has been amended to correct a typographical error, and dependent claims 24-25 have been amended for purposes of clarity and brevity and to avoid redundancy in accordance with current Office policy, to define Applicants' disclosed invention and to assist the Examiner to expedite compact prosecution of the instant application. Accordingly, entry of the foregoing amendments is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116(b) because those amendments simply respond to correct a typographical error and avoid redundancy. No new issues are raised, no further search is required, and the foregoing amendments are believed to remove the basis of the outstanding rejections and to place all claims in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by a newly cited prior art reference, Codama et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,307,317 for reasons stated on pages 2-4 of the Office Action (Paper No. 112205). For example, in support of the rejection of base claims 1, 17 and 22, the Examiner asserts that Codama '317 discloses an EL device comprising, *inter alia*:

"a first electrode unit comprising:
 first electrodes 5 formed on the substrate as a plurality of parallel evenly spaced lines, and
 first electrode terminals (not shown but required to drive the display) connected to the respective first electrodes;
 a second electrode unit comprising:
 second electrodes 4 formed in an orthogonal direction with respect to the first electrodes over the first electrodes (see Figs. 2 and 3), and
 second electrode terminals 2,3 connected to the respective second electrodes;
 an emission area formed where the first electrodes intersect the second electrodes;
 an EL layer 7 disposed between the first electrodes and the second electrodes in the emission area;
 an inter insulating layer 6 (layer contacting left side of electrode 5 in Fig. 3) provided under the EL layer and covering a space between each of the plurality of lines of the first electrodes and an edge portion of a top surface of each of the plurality of lines of the first electrodes; and
 an outer insulating layer 6 (layer contacting right side of electrode 5 in Fig. 3) between the emission area and the second electrode terminals;
 wherein the outer insulating layer comprises an insulating material formed to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area to reduce a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminal and the substrate (see Fig. 3)."

However, the Examiner's assertion is factually incorrect. Key features of Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22 are **not** disclosed or suggested anywhere by Codama '317. Therefore, Applicants traverse the rejection and respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw this rejection for the following reasons.

First of all, Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22 are directed generally to an EL device, as shown, for example, in FIG. 5 and FIG. 6, in which first electrodes (52) and their terminals (62) are orthogonal with respect to second electrodes (54) and their terminals (64), and an EL layer is disposed on an emission area between the first electrodes (52) and the second electrodes (54).

In addition, an inter insulating layer (56) is formed under the EL layer to cover spaces between each of the lines of the first electrodes (52) and an edge portion of a top surface of each of the lines of the first electrodes (52). Likewise, an outer insulating layer (66) is formed to cover the edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area in order to reduce a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminals and the substrate. This way, any possibility of the second electrodes (54) being disconnected at the edge and electrostatic shock resulting therefrom can be advantageously prevented. Connection between the second electrodes (54) and their terminals (64) can be enhanced, and rectifying characteristics of an EL device can be improved. See paragraphs [0041], [0044], and [0059] of Applicants' specification.

In contrast to Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22, Codama '317 discloses a different type of organic EL devices having a completely different electrode structure designed to address a different problem. Specifically, as shown in FIG. 3, the electrode structure of Codama '317 simply includes an underlying layer 2 formed on a substrate, an electrode layer 3 formed on the underlying layer 2, and an electron injecting electrode layer 4 deposited on the electrode layer 3 and the underlying layer 2, as shown in FIG. 4. In addition, an organic layer 7 is interposed between the electrode injecting electrode layer 4 and the electrode layer 3. However, as described on column 2, lines 3-10 of Codama '317,

"As a consequence, when the electron injecting electrode layer 4 is deposited after the deposition of the organic layer 7, contact between the electrode layer 3 and the electron injecting electrode layer 4 may become insufficient due to the high resistance of the surface portion of the electrode layer 3, and such insufficient contact results in faulty connection and failure in the full drive of the pixels."

The problem as identified by Codama '317 is addressed by patterning the electrode layer

3 in comb shape such that the underlying layer 2, as shown in FIG. 1 and FIG. 2 is partly left uncovered. As a result, electric connection with the overlying electron injecting electrode layer 4 is thereby improved. This is because the electron injecting layer 4 is in contact with both of the electrode layer 3 and the underlying layer 2, and electric connection is still secured between the electron injecting layer 4 and the underlying layer 2 which is more resistant to surface oxidation.

As apparent from the foregoing, there is **no** disclosure anywhere from Codama '317 of the orthogonal relationship between "first electrodes" and "second electrodes" as expressly defined in Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22. More importantly, there is **no** disclosure anywhere from Codama '317 of the structural relationship between "an inter insulating layer" and "an outer insulating layer" in the manner as defined in Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22.

Nevertheless, the Examiner cites element 5 of Codama '317 as Applicants' claimed "first electrodes" and element 4 of Codama '317 as Applicants' claimed "second electrodes." However, the Examiner's citation is misplaced. Elements 5 and 4 of Codama '317 simply refer to a transparent (ITO) electrode layer and an electrode injecting electrode layer that do not have an orthogonal relationship as defined in Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22; rather, an ITO electrode layer 5 of Codama '317, as shown in FIG. 3, represents **1 pixel** deposited on the substrate 1.

Similarly, the Examiner cites element 6 to cover both Applicants' claimed "inter insulating layer" and "outer insulating layer". However, the Examiner's citation is severely misplaced. Element 6 of Codama '317 only refers to a passivation film, and as described on column 6, lines 28-31, is deposited to surround the ITO electrode layer 5 (including both sides of the ITO electrode layer 5), at least one organic layer 7, and an electron injecting layer 4 formed on the substrate 1, as shown in FIG. 3. Again, no where in Codama '317 is there any element that can be used to read on Applicants' claimed "inter insulating layer" and "outer insulating layer" that are formed to perform the functions as expressly defined in Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22, that is, forming inter insulating layer (56) to cover spaces between each of the lines of the first electrodes (52) and an edge portion of a top surface of each of the lines of the first electrodes (52), and forming an outer insulating layer (66) to cover the edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area in order to reduce a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminals and the substrate.

The rule under 35 U.S.C. §102 is well settled that anticipation requires that each and every element of the claimed invention be disclosed in a single prior art reference. In re

Paulsen, 30 F.3d 1475, 31 USPQ2d 1671 (Fed. Cir. 1994); In re Spada, 911 F.2d 705, 15 USPQ2d 1655 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Those elements must either be inherent or disclosed expressly and must be arranged as in the claim. Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1989); Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc., 848 F.2d 1560, 7 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1988); Verdegall Bros., Inc. v. Union Oil Co., 814 F.2d 628, 2 USPQ2d 1051 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In addition, the prior art reference must be enabling. Akzo N.V. v. U.S. International Trade Commission, 808 F.2d 1471, 1479, 1 USPQ2d 1241, 1245 (Fed. Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 482 U.S. 909 (1987). The corollary of that rule is that absence from the reference of any claimed element negates anticipation. Kloster Speedsteel AB v. Crucible Inc., 793 F.2d 1565, 230 USPQ2d 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The burden of establishing a basis for denying patentability of a claimed invention rests upon the Examiner. The limitations required by the claims cannot be ignored. See In re Wilson, 424 F.2d 1382, 165 USPQ 494 (CCPA 1970). All claim limitations, including those which are functional, must be considered. See In re Oelrich, 666 F.2d 578, 212 USPQ 323 (CCPA 1981). Hence, all words in a claim must be considered in deciding the patentability of that claim against the prior art. Each word in a claim must be given its proper meaning, as construed by a person skilled in the art. Where required to determine the scope of a recited term, the disclosure may be used. See In re Barr, 444 F.2d 588, 170 USPQ 330 (CCPA 1971).

In the present situation, Comada '317 fails to disclose and suggest key features of Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of base claims 1, 17 and 22 and their respective dependent claims 4, 7, 8, 10, 11, 19, 20 and 23 be withdrawn.

Claims 1, 4-8, 10-14, 17, 19-23 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Miyaguchi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,297,589, view of Tadokoro et al., EP 1022931 for reasons stated on pages 4-7 of the Office Action (Paper No. 112205). Specifically, in support of the rejection of base claims 1, 17 and 22, the Examiner asserts that Miyaguchi '589, as a newly cited primary reference, discloses an EL device comprising substantially all the elements, except for the use of "an outer insulating layer 6 between the emission area and the second electrode terminals ... to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area to reduce a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminal and the substrate" which is allegedly disclosed in the secondary reference, on column 4, lines 10-23 and column 9, lines 18-32 of Tadokora '931.

Again, the Examiner's assertion is factually incorrect. As previously discussed, an outer insulating layer of Applicants' base claims 1, 17, 22, and shown in FIG. 5 and FIG. 6, is formed to cover the edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area in order to reduce a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminals and the substrate. This way, any possibility of the second electrodes (54) being disconnected at the edge and electrostatic shock resulting therefrom can be advantageously prevented. Connection between the second electrodes (54) and their terminals (64) can be enhanced, and rectifying characteristics of an EL device can be improved. See paragraphs [0041], [0044], and [0059] of Applicants' specification.

No where in the alleged column 4, lines 10-23 and column 9, lines 18-32 of Tadokora '931 is there any disclosure or suggestion of Applicants' claimed "outer insulating layer 6 between the emission area and the second electrode terminals ... to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area to reduce a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminal and the substrate" as expressly defined in Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22.

Specifically, Tadokora '931, as a secondary reference, only discloses, as previously presented in the Amendment filed on September 8, 2005, an EL device having device having a transparent electrode layer provided with display electrodes in the form of segments that are selectively activated to represent desired characters, a back electrode, and an emissive layer between the transparent electrode and the back electrode. (Tadokoro '931 paragraph [0001]). As shown in FIG. 2, the segments of the transparent electrode layer 2 disclosed in Tadokoro '931 consist of the elements of a digital numeric display. The back electrode 6 is a film of Al or Cr as a sheet. (see for example, paragraphs [0005]-[0007] and [0031]-[0033]).

The cited column 4, lines 10-23 of Tadokora '931 simply refers to the deposition of an intermediate dielectric layer (4), as shown in FIG. 1, to cover the whole surface of the transparent electrode layer 2, except for locations where display electrodes (2) and terminals (22) are present. Likewise, the cited column 9, lines 18-32 of Tadokora '931 refers to the same dielectric layer (4) made of dielectric material having a color that has excellent ability of block light such as black, and is used to cover the whole surface of the transparent electrode layer 2, except for locations where display electrodes (2) and terminals (22) are present, as described in column 4, lines 10-23.

Again, no where in the cited column 4, lines 10-23 and column 9, lines 18-32 of Tadokora '931 is there any disclosure or suggestion of Applicants' claimed "outer insulating layer

6 between the emission area and the second electrode terminals ... to contact at least an edge of the second electrode terminals facing the emission area to reduce a steepness of a step between the second electrode terminal and the substrate" as expressly defined in Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22. As a result, Tadokora '931 does **not** remedy the noted deficiencies of Miyaguchi '589 in order to arrive at Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22.

In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. §103, the Examiner must show that the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations, and that there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings, provided with a reasonable expectation of success, in order to arrive at the Applicants' claimed invention. The requisite motivation must stem from some teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art, and **not** based on Applicants' disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). See MPEP 2143. In other words, all the claim limitations must be disclosed or suggested by the prior art. In re Royka, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974). Moreover, "obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion or incentive supporting the combination." ACS Hospital System, Inc v. Montefiore Hospital, 732 F.2d 1572, 1577, 221 USPQ 929, 933 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The Examiner must point to something in the prior art that suggests in some way a modification of a particular reference or a combination of references in order to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention. Absent such a showing, the Examiner has improperly used Applicants' disclosure as an instruction book on how to reconstruct to the prior art to arrive at Applicants' claimed invention. Furthermore, any deficiencies in the cited references cannot be remedied with conclusions about what is "basic knowledge" or "common knowledge". See In re Lee, 61 USPQ 2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

In the present situation, both Miyaguchi '589 and Tadokoro '931 fail to disclose and suggest key features of Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22. As a result, even if Tadokoro '931 is incorporated into Miyaguchi '589 in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the proposed incorporation still does not arrive at Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Applicants' base claims 1, 17 and 22 and their respective dependent claims 4-8, 10-14, 19-23 and 25 be withdrawn.

Lastly, dependent claims 9, 15, 16 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as

being unpatentable over Miyaguchi-Tadokoro as applied to claims 1, 7 and 23 above, and further in view of Okuyama et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,531,815. Since this rejection is based on the correctness of the rejection of Applicants' base claims 1, 7 and 23, Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for the same reasons discussed.

In view of the foregoing amendments, arguments and remarks, all claims are deemed to be allowable and this application is believed to be in condition to be passed to issue. Should any questions remain unresolved, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicants' attorney at the Washington DC office at (202) 216-9505 ext. 232. Applicants respectfully reserve all rights to file subsequent related application(s) (including reissue applications) directed to any or all previously claimed limitations/features which have been amended or canceled, or to any or all limitations/features not yet claimed, i.e., Applicants have no intention or desire to dedicate or surrender any limitations/features of the disclosed invention to the public.

INTERVIEW:


In the interest of expediting prosecution of the present application, Applicants respectfully request that an Examiner interview be scheduled and conducted. In accordance with such interview request, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner, after review of the present Amendment, contact the undersigned local Washington, D.C. attorney at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number (202) 216-9505 ext. 232 for scheduling an Examiner interview, or alternatively, refrain from issuing a further action in the above-identified application as the undersigned attorneys will be telephoning the Examiner shortly after the filing date of this Amendment in order to schedule an Examiner interview. Applicants thank the Examiner in advance for such considerations. In the event that this Amendment, in and of itself, is sufficient to place the application in condition for allowance, no Examiner interview may be necessary.

To the extent necessary, Applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR §1.136. If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN, MCEWEN & BUI, LLP

Date: 2/28/06

By: 
Hung H. Bui
Registration No. 40,415

1400 Eye St., N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 216-9505
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510